

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are now pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

Amendment

The title has been changed to parallel the title recited in the specification. The Abstract has been amended to improved its form and readability.

Claims 1-4 have been amended to improve their form, clarity, and readability. Further, independent claim 1 has been amended to further define the mounting structure. New claim 5, which includes certain features of original claims 1-3, has been added.

No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Shozo (JP 01-260052). Claims 1 and 2 were further rejected under §102(b) as anticipated by Tajima (JP 08-311762). Finally, claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shozo or Tajima in view of Sakakibara (USP 5,353,725). Applicants submit that the pending claims patentably distinguish over these references because none of the applied references would have disclosed or taught the mounting arrangement where the mounting hardware maintains the relative mounting position of the base frame when detached from the base frame as set forth in claim 1, and the specifics of the adjustable mounting structure as set forth in new independent claim 5.

Claim 1 now calls for the first and second positioning members to be removably mounted to the base frame, while the first and second mounting members are adjustably mounted to the first and second positioning members. This enables the mounted position of the mounting members to be maintained even when the positioning members are detached from the base frame. By attaching/detaching the positioning member to/from the base frame while the embroidery frame and mounting member are attached to the positioning members, they can be attached/detached together as a unit while maintaining the adjusted mounting positions relative to the base frame. Moreover, claim 1 calls for the embroidery frame to be attached/detached independently to/from the mounting members.

Particularly because the mounted positions of the mounting members can be maintained even when the embroidery frame, the mounting members, and the positioning members are

detached together as a unit from the base frame, the unit can be readily mounted and dismounted without losing the mounting positions in relation to the base frame.

Claim 5 calls for the specifics of the adjustable mounting feature, namely the mounted-position adjusting hole having a sufficient clearance to allow the mounting member to adjust relative to the positioning member while the first screw is inserted into the base member, and an escape hole having a clearance sufficiently large to allow the second screw to pass through and secure the positioning member to the base frame without interfering with the adjustability of said mounting member relative to the positioning member.

Shozo discloses an apparatus for attaching an embroidery frame 36 to a base frame 24. The attaching apparatus includes a mounting arm 26 for mounting to one side of the base frame via a mounting bed 25 using a screw 28 (see Fig. 3), and a support member 33 for mounting to the opposing side of the base frame also using a screw 35 (see Fig. 4). The embroidery frame 36 has opposing projecting members 37 and 38 (see Fig. 6, (a) and (b)) that engage the holes 32a, 33d formed in the mounting arm 26 and the support member 33. The mounting position of the mounting arm 26 is adjustable relative to the base frame 24, while the support member 33 is fixedly (not adjustable) held by the screw 28. The projecting member 38 is inserted in the hole 33d (Fig. 5) formed in the support member 33 and the other projecting member 37 is inserted in the hole 32a formed in the mounting arm 26 to thereby attach the embroidery frame 36 between the mounting arm 26 and the support member 33.

In Shozo, a single screw 28 fastens together the base frame 24, the mounting bed 25, and the mounting arm 26. Thus, if the screw 28 is loosened to detach the mounting arm 26 from the base frame 24, the mounting position of the mounting arm 26 relative to the base frame 24 cannot be maintained, similar to the conventional apparatus discussed on paragraph 4 of in the present specification. In contrast, claim 1 calls for the first and second positioning members to be removably mounted to the base frame, while the first and second mounting members are adjustably mountable to the first and second positioning members so that the mounted positions of the mounting members are maintained even when the positioning members are detached from the base frame. Accordingly, applicants submit that independent claim 1 clearly defines over Shozo within the meaning of § 102 and § 103. Applicants also submit that independent claim 5 defines over Shozo because Shozo would not have disclosed or taught the claimed adjustable mounting features.

Tajima also discloses an apparatus for mounting an embroidery frame 16 to a base frame 15. The mounting apparatus includes mounting members 17a, 17b that are positionally-

adjustably mounted to the base frame 15. Once the mounting positions of the mounting members 17a, 17b are determined using a jig 31 (see Figs. 5 and 6), nuts 27 are tightened to secure the mounting members 17a, 17b to the base frame 15. The embroidery frame 16 is mounted on the mounting members 17a, 17b. The nuts 27 fasten together the base frame 15 and mounting members 17a, 17b, with the positions of the mounting members 17a, 17b adjusted directly relative to the base frame 15. If the nuts 27 are loosened to detach the mounting members 17a, 17b from the base frame 15, the adjusted position of the mounting members 17a, 17b cannot be maintained like Shozo. Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 1 also clearly defines over Tajima within the meaning of § 102 and § 103. Applicants also submit that independent claim 5 defines over Tajima because Tajima would not have disclosed or taught the claimed adjustable mounting features.

Sakakibara fails to alleviate Shozo's and Tajima's shortcomings identified above. Accordingly, even if the combination were deemed proper for argument's sake, applicants submit that claims 1 and 5 clearly would have distinguished over the applied references.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-5 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

23 OCTOBER 2006

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)